



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,577	08/26/2003	Douglas A. Hawks	050324-1161	5977

24504 7590 03/27/2006

THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW
STE 1750
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948

EXAMINER

TRINH, MICHAEL MANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/649,577

Applicant(s)

HAWKS ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Trinh

Art Unit

2822

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 10 March 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-8, 16, 17 and 20-27.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Michael Trinh
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Further consideration for objecting of these claims 1-8,16-17,20-27 is needed since many claimed terms/words are partially crossed out and deleted due to the inclusion of two solid vertical lines in the claim pages (for example, see attached page 4).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of rejections and clear reasons as of record.

** Applicant alleged that Yamaguchi fails to disclose "...attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before one or more isolated conductive features have been formed...", since Yamaguchi teaches "...a metal plate for lead frame 21 made of copper, for example, is etched or pressed" and "a pad assembly 16 including die pads 14, connection portions 16s and frame 16 is formed by etching or pressing another metal plate...Subsequently,...a plastic film 12...is attached..."

In response, this is noted and found unconvincing. Although there is a step of etching and pressing to form some portions the lead frame, Yamaguchi clearly teaches the claimed invention of "...attaching a removable material to a surface of conductive material before one or more isolated conductive features have been formed...". Indeed, as clearly taught by Yamaguchi at column 8, lines 45-67, after attaching the pad assembly 16 to the plastic removable material film 12, the connection portions 16a of the pad assembly 16 are cut off thereby separating the die pad 14 from the frame 16b of the pad assembly 16 in order to form one or more isolated conductive features 14. Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is a measure of the invention

** Applicant remarked that Glenn fails to disclose "...wherein the removing said material step is performed after the singulation process is performed to separate said package..."

In response this is noted and found unconvincing. Under 103 rejection, Yamaguchi teaches (at col 11, lines 41-64; Figs 7e-79 removing the removable material 12 either prior to a singulation process to separate the package (col 11, lines 41-61) or after a singulation process to separate the package (col 11, lines 62-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to remove the removable material of Glenn either after a singulation process to separate the package or prior to a singulation process as alternatively taught by Yamaguchi. This is because removing the removable material either after or prior to the singulation process are alternative and art recognized equivalent processes for substitution in fabrication of the electronic device, and because of the desirability to expose a portion of the metal lead frame and conductive features for subsequent electrical connection, wherein by removing the removable material after singulation process, the removable material would still cover and thereby consequently protect the metal lead frame from being contaminated during singulation process.

The rejections are outstanding and maintained.



Michael Trinh
Primary Examiner